

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 13, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 to Chapman et al.

Claims 7-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 to Chapman et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 20030126445 A1 to Wehrenberg.

Independent claim 1, now recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein said user is able to increase a value of said

identification information, input by a user, used for identification of a recording medium and a value of said identification information recorded on a recording medium loaded in said information playback apparatus.” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 to Chapman, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Chapman”) relates to a method and a system for controlling display of video or image data depending on content classification information, which is integrated with data by invisible digital watermarking techniques. A controller decodes the watermarked content codes and then prevents displaying of certain material, by overlaying the display with blanking data, if the codes match certain stored codes.

Specifically, Chapman teaches that a video signal is processed by an encoder that embeds an electronic watermark within each still image of the video signal. The electronic watermark represents a classification of the video content. A user then selects particular classifications which are not to be displayed.

As understood by Applicants, Chapman is teaching a filter based on a classification system.

Applicants, therefore, submit that nothing has been found in the cited portions of Chapman that would teach or suggest an apparatus comprising, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 4, 5, and 6 are also believed to be patentable for the above-recited reasons.

Independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein said user is able to increase a value of said permission condition associated with said playback device and a value of said recording medium identification for each of said one or more recording media.” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Publication No. 20030126445 A1 to Wehrenberg (hereinafter, merely “Wehrenberg”) relates to a copy protection technique utilizing a watermark and a permission key. The copy protection can be used to prevent unauthorized copying of data stored on a recording medium. Wehrenberg is directed to providing a copy protection scheme that allows a viewer to make one copy of a transmission, but prevents further copying after initial copy is made.

Applicants submit that neither Chapman nor Wehrenberg teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is believed to be patentable.

Independent claim 13 is also believed to be patentable for the above-recited reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing

above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212)588-0800